



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,581	07/15/2003	Ekambaram Balaji	030773/2868P	8889
7590 10/05/2007				
Sandeep Jaggi		EXAMINER		
LSI Logic Corporation		PRICE, NATHAN E		
Intellectual Property Law Department				
1551 McCarthy Blvd., M/S D-106		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Milpitas, CA 95035		2194		
		MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE		
		10/05/2007 PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,581

Applicant(s)

BALAJI ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan Price

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2007 and 26 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to communications received 18 June 2007 and 26 September 2007. Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are pending. Previous objections and rejections not included in this Office Action have been withdrawn.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 18 June 2007 and 26 September 2007 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645 A1; hereinafter Sharma) in view of Chiang et al. (US 6,948,174 B2; hereinafter Chiang) and Fry (US 6,880,125 B2).

5. As to claim 31, Sharma teaches a method for providing data integration and exchange between a plurality of client applications over a network, wherein each of the client applications access a respective data source (§§ 5, 65, 115), the method comprising:

(a) providing an adapter API at each of the client applications that provides a first set of methods for the client applications to use to translate data in the respective data sources into XML format, wherein the data sources of each of the client applications are stored in different formats and are not directly accessible by the other client applications (Fig. 5; §§ 5, 8 – 10, 37, 115, 127);

(b) modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format according to a registered schema definition (§§ 7, 72, 91, 115, 127, 130);

(c) submitting each of the XML files to an import repository at a server (§§ 5, 115, 127); and

(e) parsing the validated XML files in the import repository and storing name/value pairs in a database at the server according to a hierarchy specified by the corresponding DTD, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources of the client applications (§ 7, 55 – 56, 127, 173).

6. Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML format data from the respective data sources in XML files. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format data in an XML file (col. 8 lines 2 - 16; col. 11 lines 18 -46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because both disclose converting data to XML in order to provide compatibility between different systems.

7. Sharma fails to specifically teach validation as claimed. However, Fry teaches validating each of the XML files in the import repository against a document type definition (DTD) corresponding to the respective data sources (col. 2 lines 61 - 65; col. 3 lines 60 - 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because Sharma teaches that a streaming parser can be used (§ 123) and Fry provides further information on parsers, including streaming parsers (col. 3 lines 60 - 64).

8. As to claim 2, Sharma teaches including a second set of methods in the adapter API for the client applications that provides consumption logic and methods for

automatically exporting data defined in a Web-based schema registry, from the database into the client applications using Web services (§§ 5, 28, 115, 127);

9. As to claim 3, Sharma teaches registering the respective data sources with a schema registry in order to create the schema definition and the DTD (§§ 7, 72, 91, 130).

10. As to claim 6, Sharma teaches the adapter API includes an XML API comprising the first set of methods and the second set of methods, wherein the first set of methods comprises a Writer API and the second set comprises a Reader API (§§ 5, 115, 155, 173), and

11. As to claim 7, Sharma teaches that the client applications are modified with generator logic that makes calls to methods comprising the adapter API, wherein once called, the Writer API converts data into the XML format in memory and transports the data to the server (§§ 115, 155, 173). Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML format data in an XML file. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format data in an XML file (col. 8 lines 2 - 16; col. 11 lines 18 - 46).

12. As to claim 9, Sharma fails to specifically teach verification as claimed. However, Fry teaches wherein the adapter further includes verification code that verifies the generated XML data against the DTD defined in the schema registry (col. 2 lines 61 - 65; col. 3 lines 60 - 64).

Art Unit: 2194

13. As to claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 32 and 33, see the rejection of claims 31, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9.

14. As to claim 28, Sharma teaches that the server further includes a schema generator for generating the schema definition, a DTD generator for generating the DTD, and an adapter software kit that is downloaded from the server and used to incorporate the adapter API into the client applications (§§ 7, 27, 72, 109).

### ***Conclusion***

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Price whose telephone number is (571) 272-4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 2:30pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER